



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

S/T

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/124,649	07/29/98	NGAI	T ALT-155

JEFFREY H INGERMAN
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK NY 10020-1104

LM01/0612

EXAMINER

, BATAILLE, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2752

DATE MAILED: 06/12/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/124,649

Applicant(s)


Ngal et al.

Examiner

P. Bataille

Group Art Unit

2752



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 29, 1998

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Jul 29, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 & 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2752

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements submitted on October 26, 1998 and April 7, 2000 were received and have been considered by the examiner. See the attached PTO form 1449.

Oath/Declaration

2. The declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

It does not identify the city and state or foreign country of residence of each inventor.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
4. The drawings are objected to because of the problems addressed in the notice of Draftperson's Drawing Review (PTO Form 948). Correction is required.
5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(b) because they are incomplete. 37 CFR 1.83(b) reads as follows:

Correction is required.

Art Unit: 2752

Applicant is advised to label at least the following blocks indicated in drawing Figure 1, blocks 100, 101 & 12. The label to these blocks will provide a better view of the claimed invention without the use of the specification.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 3-6 and 9-12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

It seems that it is applicant's intention to recite claims 3-4 and 9-10 in independent form. The preamble only recited the purpose of the process and did not limit the body of the claim. It seems that the claimed preamble provides a different purpose of the invention. Applicant is reminded of the general order of a claim (see 37 CFR 1.75) The preamble only recited the purpose of the process and did not limit the body of the claim, *any independent claim should contain in the following order, (1) a preamble comprising a general description of all the elements or steps of the claimed combination which are conventional or known, (2) a phrase such as "wherein the improvement comprises," and (3) those elements, steps and/or relationships which constitute that portion of the claimed combination which the applicant considers as the new or improved portion.*

Art Unit: 2752

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

8. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heile (US6,020,759).

As per claims 1-2 and 7-8, Heile teaches a programmable logic array device [Fig. 2] comprising:

a plurality of logic resources [logic blocks 21, Fig. 2];

a plurality of group of interconnection conductors for interconnecting said logic resources [interconnection conductor network 23, Fig. 2]; and

a plurality of programmable interconnection resources for connecting conductors in said group of said interconnection conductors and to said plurality of logic resources [13, 18, 19, 103 & 107, Fig. 1], said programmable interconnection resources being less than fully populated [Col. 5, Lines 18-31, Lines 42-51]; said programmable logic array device includes

at least one random access memory device [10, Fig. 1 & 2] (Col. 3, Lines 7-10) having a read port [dataout conductor 110, Fig.1] and a write port [datain bus conductors 12, Fig. 1] (Col. 3, Lines 11-14);

Art Unit: 2752

a first programmable interconnection resource [103, Fig. 1] in said plurality of interconnection resources for connecting port conductors in said read port to a selected one of said plurality of group of interconnection conductors [Col. 3, Lines 39-55]; and

a second programmable interconnection resource [13, Fig. 1] in said plurality of interconnection resources for connecting port conductors in said write port to a selected one of said plurality of group of interconnection conductors [Col. 3, Lines 15-31]; wherein

said first and second programmable interconnection resources are populated to allow connection of an individual conductor in said selected one of said plurality of groups of interconnection conductors to corresponding port conductors in said read port and said write port [Fig. 4 & 5; Col. 3, Line 50 to Col. 4, Line 12].

As per claims 3-6 and 9-12, Heile teaches the programmable logic device shown in a data processing system [502, Fig. 7] including components such as a processor 504, memory board 506 and I/O circuitry 508 and other peripheral devices [Col. 6, Lines 30-33], and the said components mounted on a printed circuit board 530 [Col. 6, Lines 33-37].

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2752

US Patent No. 5,804,986 Jones Sep. 8, 1998

10. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Contact Information

11. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications,

please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Michel Bataille whose telephone number is (703) 301-0134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M..


Art Unit: 2752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9731.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

P. Bataille

May 23, 2000



JOHN W. CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700